UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,402	02/28/2007	Arthur J. O'Toole	STRAK-507 US	6109

51166   7590   01/16/2009
LEO STANGER
382 SPRINGFIELD AVENUE
SUMMIT, NJ 07901

EXAMINER
GU, YU

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4146	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 November 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.　　　　2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *24 December 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11/112008*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1.   **Claims 1-19** are presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

2.   The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 11/11/2008 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statements are being considered by the examiner.

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure filed on 12/24/2005 is objected to because it is not in proper format. The abstract is required to be put on a separate sheet , and it may not contain other information. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3.   **Claims 3** and **19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. **Claim 3** recites a "wireless control means" capable of changing the actual asset condition, however, the specification does provide sufficient support to enable one skilled in the art to make the said "wireless control means" and to practice its intended function. **Claim 19** recites the limitation *"tightly coupling and integrating intelligent wireless devices mounted on freight assets with standard shipment messages communicating*

relevant shipment conditions in the same format via a translator", which directs to

coupling and integrating a physical devices with a message, which is intangible. The

disclosure does not enable one skilled in the art to couple and integrate a physical device

with an intangible message. For the purpose this examination, the limitation in question is

interpreted as "mounting intelligent wireless devices on freight assets; and the integrating

intelligent wireless devices communicate relevant shipment condition in the same format

via a translator."

> The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> > The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> > claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4.   **Claims 4, 8, 15** and **17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, **second** paragraph, as

being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter

which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4 recites the limitation "a translator", which in view of the foregoing disclosure is

interpreted as a device that translates between two formats. However, claim 4 recites the

translator as being capable of identifying and processing conditional information. The

translator recited in claim 4 thus alludes to an information receiving /processing device.

Above conflicts of the intended function of the translated thus render claim 4 indefinite.

Furthermore, claim 4 recites the limitation "conditional information transmitted via

wireless communications **to** a remote monitoring device attached to a freight asset".

However, the specification does not support transmitting conditional information **to** the

remote monitoring device. In view of other limitations recited in claim 4 and applicant's

specification (see applicant's disclosure paragraph [0021]), and for the purpose of this

examination, the limitation in question is interpreted as "conditional information

transmitted via wireless communications **from** a remote monitoring device attached to a

freight asset"

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, **second** paragraph, as being indefinite for failing

to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention. Claim 8 recites the limitation "the intelligent device". Claim 8 further

recites the limitation "the designated location". Claim 8 still further recites the limitation

"the customer's designate location". There are insufficient antecedent basis for these

limitations in the claim. For the purpose of this examination, *"the intelligent device"* is

interpreted as "an intelligent device"; "*the designated location*" is interpreted as "a

designated location"; "*the customer's designated location*" is intercepted as "**the**

designated location. Furthermore, claim 8 recites the limitation *"**specific** arrival and*

departure freight messages". However, the disclosure lacks support for the specificity of

the recited *arrival and departure freight messages*, and thus renders the claim indefinite.

Regarding **claim 15**, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is

unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention.

See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Regarding **claim 17**, the phrase "etc." renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear

whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See

MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Objections

5.   **Claim 4** is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 4 recites

"gps", an acronym that should be capitalized. Appropriate correction is required.

6.   **Claim 12** is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 12 recites

the typo "*assed*", is interpreted as "asset". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

7.   **Claims 1-2, 4-8, 11, 16-17** and **19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over US 6865516 B1 Donald George Richardson (hereinafter Richardson) in

view of US 20020111819 A1 Li et al. (hereinafter Li).

Regarding **claim 1**, Richardson discloses *a freight management method, comprising:*

sensing a condition on a freight asset (see at least column 2 lines 36-40)*; and*

transmitting the information concerning the sensed condition over a wireless (i.e. GSM)

system to a monitor system (i.e. central location) *in one format* (see at least column 2

lines 39-42, and column 3 lines 43-49).

Richardson does not specifically disclose the limitation *translating the information*

concerning the sensed condition into a second format. However, in a related field of

endeavor, Li discloses formatting input into a XML format (thereby translating

information from one format to another, see at least Li paragraph [0004], [0034], [0136]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Richardson in view of Li in order to efficiently transmit data as

discussed by Li (see at least Li paragraph [0034])

Richardson further discloses *transmitting the information concerning the sensed condition from the monitor system to a user* (see at least column 2 lines 46-50, column 5 lines 45-55). Richardson however does not specifically disclose the information been transmitted and received is in second format. However, in a related field of endeavor, Li discloses formatting input into a XML format for transmission (thereby transmitting information in another format, see at least Li paragraph [0004], [0034], [0136]). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Richardson in view of Li in order to efficiently transmit data as discussed by Li (see at least Li paragraph [0034])

Regarding **claim 2**, Richardson and Li discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 1. Richardson further discloses *wherein said step of transmitting the information concerning the sensed condition over a wireless system to a monitor system in one format includes responding to a trigger condition derived from user designated locations, destination areas* (i.e. location)*, and freight operational settings* (i.e. using only partial function, see at least column 5 lines 1-10) *and conditions* (i.e. temperature) *on the asset* (see at least column 2 lines 58-67 and column 6 lines 1-5). Richardson however does not specifically disclose *organized to allow translating the information concerning the sensed condition into the second format*. However, in a related field of endeavor, Li discloses formatting detected information into a XML format for transmission (thereby translating the information into another format, see at least Li paragraph [0004], [0034], [0136]). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Richardson in view of Li in order to efficiently transmit data as discussed by Li (see at least Li paragraph [0034]).

Regarding **claim 4**, Richardson and Li discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection

of claim 1. Richardson further discloses:

- *a translator identifies conditional information contained within a standard freight*

  message with corresponding conditional information transmitted via wireless

  communications from *a remote monitoring device attached to a freight asset* (see

  at least column 2 lines 39-41 and 62- 67, column 3 lines 43-51);

- *the conditional information containing one of a user designated location, a*

  commodity's pre-determined temperature set point setting, an arrival notification,

  a departure notification, attachment of auxiliary power equipment, in the format a

  user within the freight shipment documentation (see at least column 2 lines 53-67

  and column 3 lines 52-62);

- *causing said translator to reconcile events derived from wireless communications*

  directly in the format contained in the freight message of gps (see at least column

  3 lines 43-51) *coordinates to a "named area or location" in a standard shipping*

  document, thereby allowing a specific sensor reading to be directly applied

  through the entire monitoring, communication and network path to create

  notifications (i.e. though the in-build integrator) *that the documented shipment*

  condition is initiated, satisfied or terminated (see at least column 2 lines 53-67

  and column 3 lines 52-62, column 4 lines 66-67 column 5 lines 1-10 and column

  6 lines 1-5).

Regarding **claim 5**, Richardson and Li discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection

of claim 1 and 2. Richardson further discloses:

- *transmitting the information concerning the sensed condition over a wireless system to a monitor system occurs automatically by extracting relevant information from standard freight shipment messages* (see at least column 2 lines 36-44 and 58-67)

- *delivering predetermined conditions via the use of a translation process* (see at least column 3 lines 52-62, where Richardson discloses delivering predetermined conditions via a temperature/location plot, which translates raw numerical data in to graphical data, there a translation process).

Regarding **claim 6**, Richardson and Li discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 1. Richardson further discloses:

- *transmitting the information concerning the sensed condition over a wireless system to a monitor system includes wireless notification transmissions events in real-time in real-time from a freight asset, based on pre-determined conditions identified in a standard freight message, and, through a translation process* (see at least column 3 lines 52-62, where Richardson discloses delivering predetermined conditions via a temperature/location plot, which translates raw numerical data in to graphical data, there a translation process)*, and associating the transmission with a meaningful event to be used for tracking and monitoring of freight assets* (see at least column 4 lines 55-65, column 5 lines 60-67 and column 6 lines 1-5).

Regarding **claim 7**, Richardson and Li discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 1. Richardson further discloses:

- *transmitting the information concerning the sensed condition over a wireless system to a monitor system includes wireless notification transmissions events in real-time in real-time from a freight asset, based on pre-determined conditions identified in a standard freight message, and, through a translation process* (see at least column 3 lines 52-62, where Richardson discloses delivering predetermined conditions via a temperature/location plot, which translates raw numerical data in to graphical data, there a translation process), *and associating the transmission with a meaningful event to be used for tracking and monitoring of a commodity transported in a freight shipment*(see at least column 4 lines 55-65, column 5 lines 60-67 and column 6 lines 1-5).

Regarding **claim 8**, Richardson and Li discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 1. Richardson further discloses:

- *evaluating information about freight shipments, contained within standard freight messages, including one of terminal operations and intermodal ramp activities and related activities within the sensors* (see at least column 5 lines 60-67 column 6 lines 1-5, where Richardson discloses the shipment going through different mode of transportation and different warehouse, therefore intermodal),

- *triggering and communicating in real time via the wireless system for automatically generating status notifications such that the triggering results in the creation of the standard freight message from the entry of the sensor into an area governed by gps coordinates on an intelligent device* (i.e. tracker), *pre-determined by the designated locations* (i.e. a warehouse) *in the customer's freight systems, corresponding to the customers' designated location, delivered in the same*

customer-oriented format generic to the customer's freight system in real-time
(see at least column 3 lines 52-62, and column 4 lines 55-62, column 5 lines 60-
67),

- *whereby specific arrival and departure freight messages are created*
  automatically by wireless communications for the same designated locations of
  the user and in the user' s freight equipment format (see at least column 5 lines
  60-67 and column 6 lines 1-2, where the consignor is sent the information in real-
  time comprising the location and the time of the freight asset, therefore arrival
  and departure freight message).

Regarding **claim 11**, Richardson and Li discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection
of claim 1. Richardson further discloses:

- *evaluating messages initiated by a sensor at one of terminal operations and*
  intermodal Ramp Activity (see at least column 5 lines 60-67 column 6 lines 1-5,
  where Richardson discloses the shipment going through different mode of
  transportation i.e. intermodal and different warehouses, i.e. terminals)

- *and freight asset location messages and related status messages, triggered by a*
  change in a critical condition to allow immediate (e.g. real-time, see at least
  column 4 lines 55-65) *exception* (i.e. distribution failure) *reporting in one of a*
  monitoring system or a user system (see at least column 3 lines 58-62 column 5
  lines 1-5).

Regarding **claim 16**, Richardson and Li discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection
of claim 1. Richardson further discloses: *triggering onto a sensor events which*
correspond terminal operations and intermodal ramp (see at least column 5 lines 60-67

column 6 lines 1-5, where Richardson discloses the shipment going through different

mode of transportation and different warehouse, therefore intermodal) *activity and*

related standard freight messages' relevant status information (see at least column 6 lines

1-5, where Richardson discloses a event triggered by some distribution failure such as

temperature abuse) *to permit a direct linkage between the users of standard freight*

information trigger events and corresponding trigger events managed by a sensor (the

consignor is able to directly see the sensor information in real-time, therefore a direct

linkage, see at least column 4 lines 55-65).

Regarding **claim 17**, Richardson and Li discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection

of claim 1. Richardson further discloses *establishing pre-determined conditions and*

trigger events (see at least column 3 lines 53-58, where the temperature tolerance range is

specified by the consigner) *on a fleet of freight assets corresponding to an individual*

user, and establishing other pre-determined conditions and trigger events on an entirely

separate fleet associated with another user (see at least column 4 lines 18-21, where

Richardson discloses each consignor accesses the system with a password to access the

system via the consigner's homepage, therefore another user i.e. will have another

password to access his/her own homepage to put in the database the pre-determined

conditions as disclose in column 3 lines 53-58)*, etc. on the basis of relevant information*

in the standard freight shipment messages, including one of lading, waybills, status

messages, and location messages (see at least column 3 lines 53-58 and Figure 3, where

the information regarding the shipment/freight's origin, destination, and properties are

described, therefore a waybill).

Regarding **claim 19**, Richardson and Li discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 1. Richardson further discloses mounting intelligent wireless devices on freight assets (see at least column 3 lines 30-35). Richardson further discloses the integrating intelligent wireless devices communicate relevant shipment condition in standard shipment messages (see at least column 2 lines 39-41column 3 lines 6-9 and lines 58-62). Richardson does not specifically disclose these standard shipment messages are communicated in the same format via a translator. However, in a related field of endeavor, Li discloses formatting (i.e. translating) input data into a XML format to prepare for transmission (thereby communicating information in the same format i.e. XML that both the transmitter and receiver can parse, see at least Li paragraph [0004], [0034], [0136]). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Richardson in view of Li in order to efficiently transmit data as discussed by Li (see at least Li paragraph [0034])

8.   **Claims 3,9-10** and **15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson in view of Li, and further in view of US 5999091 A Larry C. Wortham (hereinafter Wortham).

Regarding **claim 3**, Richardson and Li discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 1. Richardson further discloses: *comparing of the sensed condition from the monitor system transmitted over the wireless system with a standard predetermined condition specified within a standard freight shipment message* (see at least column 3 lines 52 – 63, where Richardson discloses a standard freight shipment message, with certain content and format, comprising at least temperature tolerance ranges), *to notify*

users of a disparity and provide status updates in the standard freight shipment message

of the user (see at least column 2 lines 61-67 and column 6 lines 1-5).

Richardson is silent as to the limitation *transmitting via wireless control means to*

automatically change the actual condition on the asset to conform to the condition

specified in the user's standard shipment message. However, in a related art, Wortham

discloses changing the actual condition on the asset to a specified condition (see at least

Wortham column 4 lines 14-28 and column 9 lines 10-19). It would have been obvious

to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Richardson and Li in view of Wortham

to adjust the asset condition to a specified condition "such sensitive cargo is not ruined,

harmed, destroyed, or otherwise damaged" (see at least Wortham column 4 lines 21-26).

Regarding **claim 9**, Richardson and Li discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection

of claim 1. Richardson further discloses *automatically applying specific conditional*

information contained in standard freight messages to automatically evaluate prescribed

and pre-determined shipment conditions to actual shipment conditions communicated by

wireless communications, including a prescribed temperature set point setting for a

commodity identified in the standard freight messages of a *transport equipment* (see at

least column 2 lines 61-67, column 3 lines 52-62). Richardson does not disclose the

transport equipment as a refrigerated transport equipment. However, in a related art,

Wortham discloses a refrigerated transport equipment (see at least Wortham column 1

lines 16-25, where Wortham discloses a trailer having refrigeration units). It would have

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Richardson and Li in view

of Wortham to use refrigerated transport equipment to cool the transported asset "such

that sensitive cargo is not ruined, harmed, destroyed, or otherwise damaged" (see at least

Wortham column 4 lines 21-26).

Regarding **claim 10**, Richardson and Li discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection

of claim 1. Richardson further teaches comparing the temperature of the freight asset

between the predetermined and the actual temperature (see at least column 2 lines 61-67

and column 6 lines 1-5). Richardson does not specifically teach the limitation

automatically comparing of the weight of the load of a freight asset in one of the

monitoring system and the user. However, in a related art, Wortham teaches a weight

sensor that is used to monitor load weight and trigger alarms (upon detection of alarm

events, see at least Wortham column 8 lines 58-67 column 9 lines 1-9). It would have

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Richardson and Li in view

Wortham in order to efficiently monitor and track the transported assets.

Regarding **claim 15**, Richardson and Li discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection

of claim 1. Richardson does not specifically disclose *loading pre-determined conditions*

and trigger events with a translator onto a sensor on a freight asset, said conditions

corresponding to the standard conditions contained within standard freight messages,

such as designated locations, set point temperature and presence of auxiliary equipment.

However, in a related art, Wortham teaches sensors installed on trailer having alarm

events (therefore the sensors are programmed or with pre-determined conditions, see at

least Wortham column 8 lines 58-67), and these conditions comprising at least

temperature. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify

Richardson and Li in view of Wortham in order to efficiently monitor and track the

transported asset.

9.   **Claim 12** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Richardson in view of Li, and further in view of Wortham and US 20030069648 A1

Douglas et al. (hereinafter Douglas).

Regarding **claim 12**, Richardson and Li discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection

of claim 1. Richardson further discloses: *evaluating pre-determined conditional*

information contained in standard freight messages, including one of bills of lading and

waybills (see at least column 3 lines 53-58 and Figure 3, where the information regarding

the shipment/freight's origin, destination, and properties are described, therefore a

waybill)*, to compare pre-determined shipment conditions, including a set point*

temperature of a commodity within a freight asset (see at least column 2 lines 62-67).

Richardson discloses an intelligent device (i.e. tracker/sender see at least column 3 lines

39-43) and a database containing a set point temperature (see at least column 2 lines 62-

67). Richardson is however silent as to the limitation *automatically sending commands to*

an intelligent device including the sensor on the freight asset *to change the condition,*

including the set point temperature, to be compliant with the pre-determined condition in

the standard freight message appropriate for the commodity. In a related art, Wortham

discloses changing the actual condition on the asset to a specified condition (see at least

Wortham column 4 lines 14-28 and column 9 lines 10-19). It would have been obvious

to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Richardson and Li in view of Wortham

to change the freight asset actual condition to a specified condition "such sensitive cargo

is not ruined." (See at least Wortham column 4 lines 14-28) However, Richardson, Li and

Wortham do not disclose sending commands including the set point temperature to the

intelligent device. In a related art, Douglas teaches send certain parameters (e.g.

temperature set point) to a remote point to control the temperature in the remote end (see

at least Douglas paragraph [0110]). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to modify Richardson and Li in view of Wortham, and further in view of

Douglas to send commands to an on-freight intelligent device a temperature set-point in

order to "centralize the flow of the information about the assets to optimized the dispatch,

control ... of assets." (See at least Douglas paragraph [0032]).

Richardson further discloses a standard freight status message format (see at least column

3 lines 58-62) for communicating to the user the sensor reading. Richardson does not

disclose the limitation the *said sensor sending a confirmation notification that the*

condition, such as the set point temperature, is changed, and the confirmation of the

actual conditional change is incorporated into a standard freight status message in the

format of the user's system to assure compliance to the specified condition. However, the

examiner takes official notice that confirming a change in control parameter such as set

point temperature is commonly known in the art. Therefore, it is obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to modify Richardson, Li, Wortham and Douglas to have the

sensor send a confirmation after the change of control parameters.

10.   **Claim 13 and 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Richardson in view of Li, and further in view of US 20030179073 A1 Ohanes Ghazarian

(hereinafter Ghazarian)

Regarding **claim 13**, Richardson and Li discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection

of **claim 1**. Richardson is silent as to the limitation *transmitting a command to a sensor to*

lock doors of freight asset when the asset has left a prescribed location contained in the

standard freight message. However, Ghazarian teaches a door state changing system

applied to trailer, more specifically the system unlocks the trailer door according the

location (as detected by a GPS unit) of the trailer (see at least Ghazarian abstract). It

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in art to modify Ghazarian's

invention to lock the door according the location of trailer (e.g. when it's no longer in the

warehouse), and combine the modification of Ghazarian to Richardson and Li in order to

enhance the safety of the transported asset.

Regarding **claim 14**, Richardson and Li discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection

of claim 1. Richardson further discloses *automatically initiating a shipment status*

message in standard shipment formats (see at least column 3 lines 58-62, where

Richardson discloses a standard shipment formats)*, using real-time* (see at least column 4

lines 55-65) *information from a sensor by requesting it via wireless communications, and*

wirelessly transmitting information in the standard freight message.

11.   **Claims 18** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US

Richardson in view of Li, and further in view of *DATA ELEMENTS VERSION 5 PROOF*

X12JTV Truck, VanTW Trailer, Refrigerated (hereinafter Data Element).

Regarding **claim 18**, Richardson and Li discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection

of claim 1. Richardson further discloses *wireless intelligence including a sensor on a*

freight asset to evaluate status conditions that automatically trigger transmissions (see at

least column 2 lines 39-41, column 3 lines 4-6 and 30-35, column 5 lines 65-67, column

6 lines 1-5). Richardson does not disclose that those transmissions are translated into EDI

and XML-based standard messages that including EDI 322. However, in a related art, Li

discloses using EDI standard for data collection (see at least Li paragraph [0004]), and

furthermore using XML-formatted messages for data transmission (see at least Li

paragraph [0034], [0136]). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Richardson in view of Li in order to efficiently transmit data as discussed by Li (see at least Li paragraph [0034]).

Furthermore, Richardson and Li do not disclose specifically using EDI 322. However, Data Element discloses EDI 322 as a known industry standard used for data collection (see at least Data Element page 94). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use EDI 322 because it is specifically designates Terminal Operations and Intermodal Ramp Activity, as disclosed by Data Element on page 94.

Conclusion

12.   The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

US **7046985** B2 Seales et al. describes a security system where a control parameter is sent to a remote site, and wherein the remote site, in response to successfully receiving the control parameter, transmit a confirmation to the control parameter originator.

13.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANDY GU whose telephone number is (571)270-7233. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 8:30-5:30;.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, RAMESH B PATEL can be reached on 5712723688. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/YU GU/   Yu (Andy) GU
Examiner, Art Unit 4146   Examiner
                                                           Art Unit 4146

/Ramesh B. Patel/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4146